Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

USA, Plaintiff, v. RAMSEY, Defendant.

Case No. 13-cr-00286-SI-1

RE: STIPULATION AND PROPOSED ORDER ON SENTENCE REDUCTION

Re: Dkt. No. 45

In May 2014, the defendant was sentenced, in accordance with a Rule 11(C)(1)(c) plea, to a sentence of 60 months imprisonment for his offenses under 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1); 841(b)(1)(B)(vii); 841(b)(1)(C); and 856(a). This 60 month sentence equaled the mandatory minimum for the 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1) violation.

The Probation Office has filed a Sentence Reduction Investigation Report, recommending that a sentence at the low end of the new guideline range, 57 to 71 months. That Report states: "It is noted that because the defendant qualified for all five provisions listed at USSG § 5C1.2, the 'Safety Valve' provision, the Court is no longer bound by the statutory minimum sentence of 60 months in Count One." (Dkt. No. 46, at 3). The parties have filed a stipulation in support of a sentencing reduction in this case, based on the Sentence Reduction Investigation Report. (Dkt. No. 45). They ask this Court to order a reduction from 60 months to 57 months effective November 1, 2015, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c), U.S.S.G § 1B1.10(b)(1), and Amendment 782 to the United States Sentencing Guidelines Manual.

18 U.S.C. 3582(c)(2) permits a sentence modification "in the case of a defendant who has been sentenced to a term of imprisonment based on a sentencing range that has subsequently been lowered by the Sentencing Commission ... after considering the factors set forth in [18 U.S.C.]

Case 3:13-cr-00286-SI Document 47 Filed 09/18/15 Page 2 of 2

United States District Court Northern District of California section 3553(a) to the extent that they are applicable, if such a reduction is consistent with applicable policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission." 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) (emphasis added).

Had the defendant not been eligible for the Safety Valve provision, a 57 month sentence would not have been an option. The parties' stipulation did not discuss the Safety Valve provision, but the stipulation did refer to and accept the Sentence Reduction Investigation Report.

Accordingly, based on the additional finding that defendant is Safety Valve eligible, the Court will accept the parties' stipulation and will execute the proposed amended judgment when the parties submit it to the Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 18, 2015

SUSAN ILLSTON United States District Judge